Language, Power and Social Process 18

Editors

Monica Heller
Richard J. Watts

Style and Social Identities

Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity

edited by

Peter Auer

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

ated characteristics, such as foreigners, innocent children, snobs, machos, choleric persons, petty bourgeois, etc. By typifying their animated characters, and by affiliating with or disaffiliating from them, tellers implicitly also construe their own identities. Identity management is shown to essentially rely on the portrayal of 'otherness', i.e. identity relies on alterity. Along the same lines, Helga Kotthoff in Ch. 15 investigates mocking stylizations of Germans as old-fashioned and conservative by tellers who thereby display their own identity as that of a liberal and modern person. The data are evening meals among friends in Germany and Switzerland, with academics between 30 and 40 as participants who identify in a broad sense with egalitarian gender politics. Kotthoff looks at how these academics make their liberal stance 'accountable' in a humorous way, by overdoing the distinction between themselves and those who adhere to traditional gender roles, through mocking and parody. The stylization of the 'conservatives' also includes South German dialects, while the 'liberal' tellers present their own words in (colloquial) Standard German.

Reference

Zaimoglu, Feridun
    1995   *Kanak Sprak. 24 Mißtöne vom Rande der Gesellschaft*. Berlin: Rotbuch-Verl.

Chapter 11

Playing with the voice of the other: Stylized *Kanaksprak* in conversations among German adolescents[*]

Arnulf Deppermann

1. Introduction

Compared to other Western industrial nations, it is only quite recently that Germany has become multi-cultural. It neither has a substantial colonial history, such as France and England, nor was it founded as an immigrant society, such as the USA or Canada. Until the 1960s, Germany essentially was a monolingual society with only regional, that is dialectal, but no ethnically-based linguistic variation. This picture has successively changed since the late 1950s, when the first so-called 'guest-workers' came to Germany.

Today, in the large cities of Germany, such as Berlin, Frankfurt or Cologne, but also in small towns, immigrants and their descendants of the 2nd and 3rd generation make up more than 20 percent of the population. Apart from cultivating their own native languages, these immigrants have created new varieties of German, starting with the first generation's so-called *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* ('guest-workers' German'; see Dittmar and Rieck 1977; Hinnenkamp 1982). The linguistic features of this variety were caused by insufficient knowledge of the German language and by interferences from the native tongue. In the first half of the 1990s, however, a new ethnolectal variety of German evolved (see Dirim and Auer 2004: Chapter 1). It is spoken by 2nd and 3rd generation immigrants, mainly young males who have grown up in Germany, but who are oriented towards a 'ghetto' identity. They strongly oppose integration into German society and culture, which they consider discriminating and hostile, lacking traditional male values and clearly defined gender-roles. But they refuse to continue their parents' way of life as well. These speakers have developed a code that has come to be known as *Türkendeutsch* (Androutsopoulos 2001), *Türkenslang* (Auer 2003) or *Kanaksprak* (Zaimoğlu 1995). Although it includes some Turkish features, it is a variety of German, since German is the main lexi-

fier language. I will henceforth use the term *Kanaksprak*, because the group of people who are considered to be the 'owners' of this code are not only Turks, but also Romani, Maroccans, Egyptians, etc. *Kanaksprak* is derived from the social designator *Kanacke*. In Germany, this is widely used as an abusive term to refer to people who look like foreigners of southern origin. It has, however, been appropriated by so-called *Kanacken* themselves as a self-categorization which at least partly inverts its negative evaluation (comparable to the 'black is beautiful'-movement in the U.S.; see Zaimoğlu 1995). *Kanacke* strictly is neither an ethnic nor a national category-term. It is predicated upon perceptual features which are taken to index people's national and ethnic membership, and thus is applied to people with very different ethnic origins and national identites. Moreover, its use is restricted to refer to male adolescents and male young adults. Despite its potentially abusive connotation,[1] I will use *Kanaksprak* as an emic term for analytical concerns. This practice should not be mistaken to mean that I subscribe to its evaluative meaning.

Starting in 1995, *Kanaksprak* increasingly has become an object of stylization in the media, mainly in various comedy-formats (see Androutso-poulos 2001). Consequently, it has become popular among German young-sters to insert fragments of stylized *Kanaksprak* into their conversations.[2]

To date, there are some studies of *Kanaksprak* (Auer 2003; Dirim and Auer 2004; Eksner and Orellana 2005; Füglein 2000; Kallmeyer and Keim 2003b; Keim 2003a and 2007; Tertilt 1996 and 1997) and its representation in the media (Auer 2003; Androutsopoulos 2001; Kotthoff 2004). Auer and Androutsopoulos have gathered interview data on German youngsters' attitudes towards *Kanaksprak* and self-reports concerning their use. But to my knowledge, no studies exist that inquire into how *Kanaksprak* is used by German adolescents.[3] This will be the focus of my paper.

My study is concerned with a secondary ethnolect, a stylization of the 'other tongue' (cf. Coupland 2001; Rampton 1999). It is adequate to speak of 'stylization', because the German speakers do not use this code as a sub-stantive enrichment of their basic repertoire (in contrast, e.g., to the use of Turkish as described in Auer and Dirim 2003 and Dirim and Auer 2004). They treat stylized *Kanaksprak* as a fun-code that is used for very restricted conversational and identity-related concerns.

Since in many cases this stylization of *Kanaksprak* does not rest on di-rect experience with its speakers, but is modelled upon media representa-tions (which are already stylizations), the code under study can in many cases aptly be called a 'tertiary ethnolect' (cf. Auer 2003). While it is often

impossible to tell exactly how media stylization and direct experience relate to one another, there are some hints in my data to answer this question at least partially (see below).

The use of stylized *Kanaksprak* is a case of language crossing as defined by Rampton (1995, 1998): A group of people uses a code that 'belongs' to a different ethnic (or cultural) group. Moreover, stylized *Kanaksprak* is an appropriation of a minority code by a majority. This is a kind of code-switching which is in some ways atypical (but see Androutsopoulos 2003, the papers in Rampton 1999 and Keim 2002).

The primary aim of my paper is to analyze the use of stylized *Kanaksprak* in conversations among German adolescents. My approach will mainly be conversation analytic as it focuses on the sequential analysis of the conversational organization and functioning of *Kanaksprak*. However, it is supported and supplemented by ethnographic data and by recovering intertextual references to media models, which are vital for gaining a fuller understanding of the identity-dimensions of *Kanaksprak* in German youngsters' conversations. Section 2 will sketch how *Kanaksprak* is represented in the media. Section 3 will summarize how the German youngsters under study talk about speakers of *Kanaksprak*. The main body of analyses will then be devoted to conversational sequences in which the German youngsters use stylized *Kanaksprak*.

I take the conversation analytic view which holds that people's social identities and the features associated with them are neither invariably fixed nor relevant for just any interaction. Rather, they are locally invoked and flexibly shaped by ways of speaking (see Antaki and Widdicombe 1998). Social identities are associated with co-occurring ways of speaking, non-verbal behaviour, preferences for dressing, status symbols, etc. In sum, these co-occurrences amount to a social style, that is, a holistic configuration which is perceived as belonging together and which represents a common socio-symbolic meaning (see Kallmeyer and Keim 2003a), in our case, the image of the stereotypical speaker of *Kanaksprak* (see section 3). Like most other practices of crossing, stylized *Kanaksprak* is a kind of stylization (cf. Coupland 2001) of the other tongue which locally invokes and assesses social identities. Stylized *Kanaksprak* bears as well on the identity of the speaker as on the identities of the addressee and of the stylized other. So, using stylized *Kanaksprak* accomplishes various acts of self- and other-positioning at once (see section 4).

My data come from a research project that aimed at inquiring into the range of interactional practices by which male adolescents organize their

peer-group interactions.[4] We observed a peer-group of about 20 boys aged 14 to 17 who live in a small town near Frankfurt/Main (Germany). Naturally occurring verbal interactions were tape-recorded in various settings, such as in the local youth center, on bus tours, in restaurants, and on the local skating-ground. Extensive fieldwork included regular participant observation for more than two years. Additionally, we conducted in-depth interviews with the members of the peer-group and with youth workers, the mayor, parents, and further significant others.

The central members of the peer-group we studied were of German origin, but it also included an Italian, a Moroccan and a Turkish boy as peripheral members. The boys' social background was mostly upper working and middle class. In the small town where the study was conducted, only a small percentage of the inhabitants is of immigrant origin (ca. 10% of the inhabitants). In nearby Frankfurt, where the boys went to school rsp. to work, the percentage of immigrants is more than 50%. It was at school and in work settings, but also at local events, such as disco nights and in the youth center, that members of the peer group regularly got into direct contact with youngsters of Turkish, Arabian and Slavic origin. Situations of contact are mostly avoided by both sides. Direct verbal conflicts and physical fights were rare, but happened now and then. While the members of the peer-group sometimes referred to these specific ethnic and national identities, they mostly used the abusive cover-categorizations *Kanacken* or *Hawacks* (see above). Individual immigrant members of the peer-group were also sometimes addressed by these terms. This, however, only happened in a playful, but competitive frame, especially in ritual insulting sequences called *dissen* (from: to disrespect, see Deppermann and Schmidt 2001b).

2. Stylized *Kanaksprak* in the media: A fun-code

Stylized *Kanaksprak* and related varieties have been *en vogue* in German media since the late 1990s. Comedians such as Kaya Yanar (who is of Turkish-Arabian origin) and Stefan und Erkan have made stylized *Kanaksprak* popular among German adolescents. I will concentrate on the comedy-duo *Mundstuhl*, because the dialogues between their characters *Dragan* and *Alder* serve as the main media model for the adolescents under study. *Mundstuhl* are Germans who originate from the same region as the adolescents, i.e. the south of Hessia. The youngsters know the *Mundstuhl* produc-

tions, which are available on CD and can also be heard on radio and seen on TV, very well and can even cite some passages by heart.

Typical linguistic features of the *Mundstuhl*-dialogues are (see also Androutsopoulos 2001; Auer 2003; Kotthoff 2004):

- phonetics: sometimes an epenthetic vowel is inserted into word-initial clusters of consonants (*Schäpäruch* instead of *Spruch* 'slogan'); lack of umlaut (*grunst* statt *grünst* 'gets green'); reduction of /st/ to /s/ (*weiß=u?* instead of *weißt du?* 'do you know?'); coronalization of /ch/ to /sch/ (*isch* for *ich* 'I' – this feature is probably borrowed from the Hessian dialect)
- prosody: syllable-timed instead of stress-timed prosody
- syntax: omission of prepositions and articles; inversion of word order: VS instead of SV as in *hab isch gekauft neue BMW* (instead of *ich habe einen neuen BMW gekauft* 'I bought a new BMW')
- lexis: extremely frequent use of some adjectives and adverbs such as *krass* ('gross'), *korrekt* ('correct'), *konkret* ('concrete'). Their semantics deviates from standard German; they are all used as (positive and negative) evaluative markers; in contrast to primary ethnolectal speakers, there are no non-German lexical items e.g. of Turkish origin
- semantics: these adjectives (*krass* etc.) and other lexical items are almost desemanticized, retaining only a ritual function as code- and identity-markers. Moreover, stylized *Kanaksprak* is marked by hyperbolic and vulgar expressions used for intensification. Many of them are taken from German youth slang (such as the adverbials *voll* 'full', *echt* 'real', the prefixes *scheiß-* 'shit', *arsch-* 'ass', *ober-* 'over'; cf. Androutsopoulos 1998)
- phraseology: incorrect, contaminated idiomatic expressions like *nicht mehr alle Tassen im Kopf* which is a blend of *nicht mehr alle Tassen im Schrank* (idiomatic like 'one stick short of a bundle'; literally: 'no longer all cups in the cupboard') and *nicht richtig im Kopf* (literally: 'not right in the head')
- turn-design: *Alder* expands most of his turns by the tag *weiß=du* ('you know?'); *Dragan* uses in almost all of his turns the address-term *alder* ('oldster') as a turn-exit device
- sequence-organization: ritualized openings/greetings *was geht – was geht* ('what's up?'); highly ritualized, symmetrically paired actions (mainly positive evaluations: *konkret – konkret* ('concrete') sometimes repeated over several turns) and a stereotypical closing *du bist krass al-*

der – ich weiß (*'you are gross oldster – I know'*); often there is a competition between the two characters about who can tell the more newsworthy and the more extreme story; this results in a competition of bragging and showing off
– topics: mobile phones, tuning cars, personal achievement (sports, business) or talk about newly learnt words, songs.

Mundstuhl ridicule the purportedly prototypical *Kanaksprak*-speaker who lives in Germany's immigrant 'ghettos'. Indeed, a lot of these linguistic features can also be identified in authentic speech of immigrant adolescents with a 'ghetto'-background (see Auer 2003; Auer and Dirim 2004).[5] However, their frequency and intensity is exaggerated in the comedies, and the linguistic repertoire of the stylized characters is much more restricted. The majority of these features (apart from coronalization, phraseological blends, use of tags and topical choice) are specific to (stylized) *Kanaksprak* and do not appear in domestic varieties of German. *Kanaksprak*-speaking comedy-characters are ridiculous because of the contrast between their high aspirations and claims on the one hand and their poor actual performances; one can laugh at them because of gross verbal and reasoning mistakes, absurd and stupid ideas and the repetitiveness of their conversations that are framed as being most important but that carry only minimal meaning. All of these comedy-formats are popular predominantly among youngsters, while adults take less notice of them. Among immigrants, their evaluation is not unanimous. Some of them take them to be offensive, some of them identify themselves with the comedy-characters as role-models, while the majority seems to regard the comedies as inoffensive gags. Public debates on the media also focus on whether such comedies are merely fun, blatant racism or rather a sign of an advanced public reaction to experiences of immigration which are no more subject to taboo or domination by a moral agenda.[6]

3.   Images of the other: German adolescents' constructions of the identity of the *Kanaksprak* speakers

Talk about *Kanacken* was very common among the peer-group of German youngsters we studied. They repeatedly told jokes and stories about experiences with *Kanacken* and they assessed locations (such as clubs, restaurants or a foreign town), clothing or music styles with respect to them. Places

where *Kanacken* go were avoided or devaluated. 'You look/talk like a *Kanack(e)*' was a severe criticism that could be used to threaten the status of a peer-group member or any other German youngster. *Kanacken* were generally despised and sometimes feared. But this rejection did not apply to every male adolescent of Arabian or Turkish origin. Some of them were respected and accepted as peers, and the boys also told stories about positive experiences with them. Positive individual ascriptions, however, were not generalized to the generic categories *Kanacke/Hawack*.

The identity-attributes that the German adolescents ascribed to *Kanacken* are quite similar to those which are peculiar to the speakers of stylized *Kanaksprak* in media comedies (see Androutsopoulos 2001):

– *Kanacken* use mobile phones, although they do not need them, just in order to show how important and popular they are.
– They wear distinctive clothes from specific brands, such as Buffalo shoes and Helly Hanson jackets.
– They are aggressive and violent; we recorded several accounts of brawls which were said to have been provoked by *Kanacken*. They were portrayed as looking for trouble without a cause. The German adolescents were afraid of them and conceded that they had no physical means against the *Kanacken*.
– They perform dismally at school. Intellectual, educational deficits and disadvantages that go along with them, such as bad marks in school, having to repeat classes or difficulties in finding estimated jobs, were welcomed by the Germans boys as compensation and revenge for their own physical inferiority.
– *Kanacken* were often associated with drug-dealing and petty crimes.
– They were portrayed as bragging and claiming abilities and moral characteristics they do not live up to, thus as being ridiculous and untrustworthy.

The last ascription touches on the role of *Kanaksprak* for defining the identity of the *Kanacken*. Their language is judged to be indicative of their character, since its pragmatics, but also its semantic and phonological features attest to identity-attributes that are quite distinctive and subject to devaluation and ridicule.

4.   German adolescents' use of stylized *Kanaksprak*

My observations rest on 23 sequences of stylized *Kanaksprak* which I could find in my corpus of about 30 hours of audio-recordings of adolescents' conversations. The following typology covers all instances in my corpus. One use of stylized *Kanaksprak* in conversation consisted in quoting *Kanaksprak* speakers. We can discern two different kinds of animating them in conversation: Personal quotations (4.1) and a practice which I will call 'category-animation' (4.2). The overwhelming quantity of conversational uses of *Kanaksprak* in my data, however, consisted in playful assessments (4.3). I will discuss the three practices taking into account the following aspects:

– In which conversational contexts is stylized *Kanaksprak* used?
– What are the linguistic properties of stylized *Kanaksprak* (including turn design)?
– How is code-alternation between the conversational base-code and stylized *Kanaksprak* managed?
– How are sequences of stylized *Kanaksprak* organized internally?
– What are the semantic and interactional functions of stylized *Kanaksprak*?
– What are the local identities of self and *Kanaksprak*-speakers that are constructed in these sequences?

4.1. Quotations

By a quotation, I mean an instance of stylized *Kanaksprak* that is framed as the rendering of the speech of a specific person. Here is an example. The German adolescents talk about Turkish boys who live in their region. Denis refers to *Hawacks* who are supposed to be in Knut's class, but Knut does not manage to understand whom Denis refers to (lines 03, 05). Denis now uses a quotation of a *Hawack*, in order to provide identification (lines 08–09).

(1) *der spast (Juk 17)*

```
01 Denis: du hast ja auch <<len> vOll die kO:mischen
          hAwacks
          'you really have tOtally strAnge 'hAwacks''
02        bei dir in de gruppe ey,> (-)
          'with you in your group ay, (-)'
```

```
03 Knut:    ja wer bei mIr?
            'well who with mE?'
04 Denis:   =äh also in de kl:- (.) in de klAsse, (-)
            '=ah I mean in the cl:- (.) in the clAss, (.)'
05 Knut:    isch hab kein: hAwack-
            'I have no: 'hAwack-''
06          (1,0)
07 Bernd:   [höhö-]
            ['haha-']
08 Denis:   [kenns]te der eine spAst der immer so
            <<all>komisch labert,>
            '[dya k]now the crAnk who always speaks so
            strange'
09          <<f, chocked voice, continously falling intona-
            tion>
            HÖY Aldär höy OAldär öy kr↓Ass öy,>
            'HOY MAte hoy MAte oy gr↓Oss oy,'
10          hh. he. (-)
11 Frank:   <<len> is=bald ↑Uldra den kerle wEIß=u,> (-)
            'is real ↑Uldra the guy y=knOw. (-)'
12 Knut:    wEn meinst=en dU? (1,0)
            'whO d=you mEAn? (1,0)'
```

Up to line 08 the youngsters use their preferred we-code. This is a more or less dialectal variety of colloquial German interspersed with youth slang. It is the code that is mostly used in informal leisure-time conversations among the adolescents when adults are not present. In line 09, Denis quotes a *Hawack* that allegedly attends Knut's class: *HÖY Aldär höy AOldär öy kr↓Ass öy*. The quotation is most prominently set off from previous talk: Denis not only frames the quotation metapragmatically (see line 08), it is also the dramatic change of his voice that marks the switch. Denis speaks in a choked and rasping voice, which gets increasingly lower until it reaches almost the lower extreme of Denis' intonational range. The articulation sounds imprecise: the vowels are realized by a backward move of the tongue (velar [ɒ] instead of [a]; [ɵ] instead of [ɛ]); there is a lenisation of the fortis-plosive [t] to [d], and the /r/ is pronounced [ʀ]. The lexis consists of items that are 'code-markers' for *Kanaksprak*: the words *krass* and *alder*, together with a few others (such as *korrekt*, *konkret*, see the next examples), form a repertoire of lexical items speakers of *Kanaksprak* are assumed to use in nearly every turn. The quotation has no syntactic structure; it consists of the attention-getter or intensifier *ey*, the tag *alder* and the

evaluative adjective *krass*. The extreme assessment contrasts with almost complete lack of propositional content – there is no recognizable referent (for a summary of features of stylized *Kanaksprak* in my data see Table 1).

Table 1. Linguistic features defining stylized *Kanaksprak* in German youngsters' conversations

Phonetics/Pronunciation	apical [r]; reduction of /ts/ → /s/; coronalisation of [ç] → [ʃ]; lenisation of fortis-stops ([t] → [d]; [k] → [g]); vowels pronounced with a backward move of the tongue: closed → open vowels; (imprecise articulation)
Phonology/Voice quality	frequent elongation of vowels; (choked voice), (rasping voice), (rumbling, scanning rhythm), ((slow and sluggish))
Grammar	overgeneralized use of *den* as pronoun/article; wrong agreement
Syntax and turn-design	excessive use of tags; inversion of the word order of main clauses: VS instead of SV, violation of the German *Verbklammer*; often lack of syntactic structure (one-word sentences)
Lexis	excessive use of stereotypical code-markers *krass, korrekt, konkret, alder*; Turkish lexis, such as *lan, tam, tschai, tschi, tschucki*
Semantics	semantic widening of evaluative adjectives; use of upgrading prefixes such as *ultra* as evaluative adjectives
Phraseology	abusive slogans/ritual sayings (threats, insults)

Features that are only typical of quotations and category-animations are represented in brackets; double brackets indicate idiosyncratic variants.

Frank aligns with Denis' code-switch (line 11). He also uses stylized *Kanaksprak* (see next section for the analysis), but changes the perspective: He assumes the voice of an anonymous *Kanacke* who admires the character that Denis has quoted. Frank thus agrees with the upshot (cf. Heritage and Watson 1979) of Denis' quotation which is designed to characterize the quoted speaker's identity.

In this sequence, we can see how stylized *Kanaksprak* is used in order to ascribe identities to self and other by a layering of voices (cf. Günthner

1999, 2002; see also Bakhtin 1981; Rampton 1995, 1998). In order to describe the different identities that are involved, I will use the 'positioning'-theory (Bamberg 1997; Harré and van Langenhove 1999; Korobov 2001; Lucius-Hoene and Deppermann 2002) which in my view is most suited to capture the different levels and referents of local identity-constructions in discourse (see Table 2).

Table 2. Layers of positioning

1st layer	other-positioning	representation of the self-positioning of the *Kanacken*
2nd layer	attitude toward other-positioning	attitude toward the 1st layer
3rd layer	representational self-positioning	versus represented other (= *Kanacken*)

4th layer	interactional self-positioning of
	* I: as individual
	* we: as peer-group
	     as Germans
	     as media-experts
		versus co-interactant

In line 11, Frank shows his agreement with Denis' other-positioning of the *Kanacke* in Knut's form by ironically formulating the social identity that the quoted speaker is said to claim (cf. Kotthoff 2002): It is the identity of a strong and very macho male who demands attention and issues apodictic statements. But this other-positioning is only a first layer. A second layer is the attitude that the speaker assumes towards the other. The social identity that the fictitious *Kanacke* claims for himself is contested and ridiculed. This already becomes apparent by the metapragmatic framing of the quotation, where the quoted speaker is called a *spast* (line 08).[7] *Spast* is an abusive youth slang-term derived from *Spastiker* (denoting 'disabled persons suffering from spastic paralysis'). *Spast* is used in order to attribute intellectual deficits and social incompetence. The *spast's* way of speaking is characterized as *komisch labern* ('speaking strange'), which is a derogatory

verbum dicendi. This attribution is further elaborated on by the quotation itself: The quoted speaker is despised as a braggart, who in reality is extremely stupid and incompetent. Especially Denis' imprecise pronunciation contextualizes his contempt against the *spast's* lack of civilization and self-control (see above). In this sequence, *Kanaksprak* is judged as a low prestige variety that attests to a lack of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1983). Paralleling Bourdieu's argument concerning the lacking prestige of dialects, it seems to be mainly the phonological features of stylized *Kanaksprak* that are linked to an uncivilized habitus (Bourdieu 1982). Language is not just one contingent feature among others that belongs to a *Kanacke* – the linguistic and pragmatic properties of *Kanaksprak* are regarded as features that have intrinsic sociosymbolic values and that are central in order to define the speakers' identities (cf. Kallmeyer and Keim 1994; Kallmeyer 1995). They express 'cultural rich points' (Coupland 1996; here: central dimensions of identity) and can be used to identify speakers. A third layer of self-positioning can now be seen as being implicitly contextualized by the other-positioning and the attitude towards it: The speakers claim higher status for themselves. Their language contrastively is framed as attesting to more intelligence, a higher degree of civilization and verbal skill. In Rampton's terminology (Rampton 1995: 300 and 1998), the boys switch to stylized *Kanaksprak* ironically, performing a 'vari-directional double-voicing', in which the (allegedly) original intention of the *Kanaksprak*-character is subverted, ironicized and mockingly held against him.[8]

4.2. Category-animations

Frank's turn *is=hald ↑Uldra den kerle wEIß=u,* (line 11) is spoken in a footing (Goffman 1981) that is not his own. It is not a personal quotation, but an instance of a practice I will call 'category-animation' (*sensu* Goffman 1981: 143; see also Levinson 1988). By this I understand cases in which an utterance is framed as indexing some category of persons. The speaker does not claim to report something that has really been said (cf. Hartung 2002: 99). Sometimes the speaker does not even pretend that he refers to a specific person at all. Instead, category animations represent ways of speaking that are regarded as most typical and at times even constitutive of the category *Kanacke* itself.[9] This indexicality concerns the (linguistic) form of the utterance as well as its content and its pragmatics (speech acts, claims to identity).[10] I use the term 'category-indexical' in-

stead of the well-known 'category-bound' (see Sacks 1972; Jayyusi 1984) in order to stress that the ways of speaking in question are not only framed as being typical of *Kanaksprak*; rather, they are used as devices to identify the animated character unambiguously as a *Kanacke*.[11]

Frank's turn: *is=hald ↑Uldra den kerle wEIß=u* is a clear case of a category-animation as he assumes the voice of an anonymous speaker of *Kanaksprak*. Frank partly uses the same linguistic properties as Denis in line 10 (e.g. lenisation, inarticulate speech, an extreme, but propositionally empty assessment (*uldra*), tag – here: *weiss=u*), and some additional features which are assumed to be typical of *Kanaksprak*: he reduces the consonant cluster /st/ to /s/ (*weiß=u* instead of *weißt du*), he talks slowly and sluggishly, he inverts the order of subject and verb (VS instead of SV: *is uldra den kerle* instead of *der kerl ist ultra*), the standard German pronoun *der* is replaced by *den*, and he uses the prefix *uldra* as an adjective.

In this case the category had already been established in the previous turn. In the next example the category-animation serves to construct a they-identity. Bernd and Wuddi are passing a house where Romani people live. They do not know these people, but they know that it is the home of *Kanacken*. Pointing to the house, Bernd sings:

(2) *isch fig disch (Juk 9)*

```
01 Bernd:  <<sings> lümm>  (-) kanagge     [näd da:?     ]
           ((singing tone))  (-) ''kanak'  [not the:re?]'
02 Wuddi:  [<<len>I:sc]h fI:g dI:sch lA:n;  (.)
           '[I: ] fU:ck yOU: mA:n;  (.)'
03 Wuddi:  I:sch> <<all> gib dir> korRE:KT-  (.)
           'I:  give you corRE:CT-  (.)'
04 Wuddi:  trEt dir in die frEsse;  [(.) LAN;   ]
           'kIck you in the fAce;   [(.) MAN;   ]'
05 Bernd:                           [aha ha HA-]
                                    '[uhu hu HU-]'
```

In the beginning, Bernd makes a non-lexical, singing noise[12] which establishes an imitation-frame: [y]-sounds are considered as code-markers for Turkish among German youngsters. Bernd's question about the whereabouts of the *Kanacken* (line 01) is some kind of stylized Gastarbeiterdeutsch rather than stylized *Kanaksprak*: Not only the article, but also the verb is missing. Wuddi answers with a category-animation (lines 02–04). In his first turn-constructional unit (line 02: *I:sch fI:g dI:sch lA:n;*), he pro-

duces a scanning rhythm. It represents the rumbling sound that Germans often attribute to *Kanaksprak*. Wuddi uses also lenisation and speaks very slowly with elongated vowels ([g] instead of [k], [fi:g] instead of [fik]). As a tag, he twice uses the Turkish word *lan*, meaning 'young man'.[13] Probably, this is the most widely known Turkish word among German youngsters, and it is regularly used as a social categorization for *Kanaksprak*-speakers. The phraseologism *I:sch gib dir korre:kt* (line 03) does not only contain the code-marker *korrekt* with its characteristic apical pronunciation. It is a ritualized saying, meaning that the speaker announces that he will defeat, and maybe do harm to, the addressee.[14] The three turn-constructional units have very similar structures: they are about the same length and share a common rhythm, each of them contains a sentence, and they all perform a ritualized threat. This repetitive structuring evidences the speaker's stylistic orientation to a poetic performance (cf. Bauman and Briggs 1990; Hymes 1996). The poetic features themselves reflexively index locally relevant identities.

In contrast to the first example, this category-animation is semantically dense – it is not only a vignette of a communicative habitus, but it also denotes values and action preferences of the fictitious, animated speaker. All three phrases are ritualized threats that position their author as someone who is physically strong and dangerous. Since there is no justifying context, this practice is contextualized as violent, obscene and looking for trouble without a cause. Especially the threat to 'fuck' the opponent is well known from Turkish verbal duelling: the attacker announces that he will make his opponent a victim of sadistic homosexual practices, thus depriving him of his sexual reputation as a male.[15] While the positioning of the other in this case is quite easy to see, self-positioning is not so clear: Does the animator position himself as being afraid of becoming a potential victim? Does he discredit the threatening behaviour as a ridiculous bluff and see himself as superior? Does he symbolically take revenge for defeats and a perceived disadvantage by exposing *Kanacken* to mockery? As in the previous example, there are again implicit claims to a more civilized status and higher verbal and intellectual competence. Wuddi's self-positioning towards the addressee Bernd, however, is easy to be seen: He displays the rhetorical skills of a spontaneous artful verbal performance. Bernd's laughter acclaims this and makes it an interactional success.

Quotations and category-animations are primary ways to characterize *Kanacken*. This does not only highlight the fact that *Kanaksprak* itself and the actions performed with it are defining characteristics of *Kanacken*. Quoting and mimicry can also be seen as a rhetorical resource that is de-

signed to convey identity-ascriptions in an implicit, but nevertheless effective way which is much better protected from criticism than any explicit propositional statement about *Kanacken* would be (cf. Günthner 2002). While the latter could be challenged, the inferences drawn from mimicry can be rejected as not intended. The same rhetorical advantage applies to the claims to the speaker's own identity, such as being more civilized, more verbally competent and intellectually superior to the *Kanacken*.

4.3. Playful assessments

The overwhelming number of stylized uses of *Kanaksprak* in my corpus are instances of a practice I call 'playful assessments'. Playful assessments are evaluations that are contextualized as being unserious, jocular remarks. Stylized *Kanaksprak* is thus mostly used as a fun-code that defines the key of the ongoing interaction: it is framed as entertainment.

This will become apparent in the next sequence. The boys are standing at a ski-lift and are talking about girls they have just seen. Frank and Denis disagree on which girl is most attractive (lines 01–08). In line 11, Denis switches into stylized *Kanaksprak*, and Bernd and Frank align with the code-switch:

(3) *blond ultrakrass (Juk 17)*

```
01 Frank:  hey die blond knut, (.)
           'ay the blond one knut, (.)'
02         des war en traum oder? (.)
           'wasn't she a dream? (.)'
03 Denis:  <<laughing> die ANdere, > (.)
           'the other, (.)'
04         die- (-) ziemisch
           'the- (.) quite'
05         <<voice breaks> BR↑AUNE, (.) die war GEIL ey.>
           'BR↑OWN ONE, (.) she was FUCKin A ey.'
06 Frank:  och komm- (.)
           'now come on- (.)'
07         die blond war- (-)
           'the blond was- (.)'
08         ä BRETT war des e [geRÄ::T (.)
           'a HIT was this a [thI:ng (.)'
09                           [((incomprehensible)) (---)
```

```
10 Bernd:  ja, (.)
            'yes, (.)'
11          schieb ma=n a:rsch wieder hoch, (---)
            'move your a:ss up again, (.)'
12 Denis:  <<len, slightly laughing> aldär- (.) KONkret,
                                      'mate  concrete,'
13          (.) ober- (.) KRASS.> (.)
            '(.) supergross. (.)'
14 Bernd:  is ultraKRASS. (.)
            'is ultragross. (.)'
15 Frank:  <<len, h> den is <<f> u:ltragEIl,> (.)
                     'them is      u:ltra fucking A, (.)'
16          aldär, (.)
            'mate, (.)'
17          den hab isch schon gesä:hn LETZte
            'them have I already seen LAST'
18          [ja::hr, (.) hey aldär.> (.)]
            '[year, (.)   ay mate.>   (.)]'
19 Denis:  [TA::M     ey::,      ] total TA::M. (.)
            '[ri::ght   ay::,      ] totally RI::GHT. (.)'
20          [ta::m    (ha:h.)]
            '[ri::ght (hu:h.)]'
21 Frank:  [ta:m     TSCHU]cki aldär. (.) <<p> tschU:cki;>
            '[ri:ght    FINE] mate.   (.)        fi:ne;'
22 Wuddi:  mayer- (-) mein bein mal- (-) an deinem- (.)
            'mayer- (-) my leg just- (-) past your- (.)'
23          fuß da vorbei dass isch (nacken) könnte.
            'foot that I could (   ).'
24          ((door of the car is closed))
25 Bernd:  vierzsch mack kost=es. (-)
            'forty marks is this. (.)'
26 Frank:  tschucki, (.) <<len> TA:M- (.)    altär.>
            'fine, (.)          RI:GHT- (.)  mate.'
27          (1.2)
28          alex? (.) schmeißt mal mei cassett an=em?
            'alex? (.) will you turn on my cassett=ah?'
```

Lines 12–16 contain the most prototypical occurrences of *Kanaksprak* in my corpus: they exclusively consist of the (in Labov's 1972 sense) stereo-typical items *konkret, krass, ultra* and *aldär*, delivered with code-marking phonetics (apical [r] and backward pronunciation of the vowels, partially

with choked voice) and used as one-word comments. They are not embedded into a syntactic frame. This feature, as well as their semantics and their sequential placement, provides them with an interjection-like grammatical status. By using these features, the code-switch is clearly marked, although there is no metapragmatic announcement or thematic environment that makes it expectable. There is no intra-sentential or intra-turn code-switching: Speakers who use stylized *Kanaksprak* take care to separate it clearly from their unmarked we-code by packaging it in distinct segments.

In Frank's turn (lines 15–18), we find some additional features of stylized *Kanaksprak*: sluggish delivery with prolonged vowels, the pronoun *den* instead of *die*, incorrect agreement between adjective and noun (*letzte jahr*, lines 17–18), numerous tags (*aldär* in lines 12, 16, 18, 21, 26) and alteration of word order (violation of the German S-Aux-O-V-order, line 17). In lines 19–21 and 26 words occur that are of Turkish origin: *tam* (an abbreviation of *tamam* 'exactly', 'that's right') and *tschucki* which is derived from *çok iyi* ('tremendous', 'fine').

In this sequence, speakers switch into stylized *Kanaksprak* in order to continue a disagreement about girls. From the beginning, it is at least partially a playful competition, because it is prosodically contextualized as fun (mainly by Denis who starts it laughingly in line 03ff.), and it probably will not have any consequences. As Denis switches into stylized *Kanaksprak* (line 12), the competition is at risk of losing its entertaining value, since it starts to move in circles. In this context, code-switching can be seen as a poetic variation. It introduces a new aesthetic resource which is in line with the playful and mainly rhetorical character which the competition has had from the outset. If we take a closer look at the succession of codes, the poetic character of the competition becomes evident:

Frank starts in colloquial German (*en traum*, 01–02),
Denis uses an old, already conventionalized item of youth-slang (*geil*, 05),
Frank opposes him with new items of youth slang (*brett, gerät*, 06–08),
Denis initiates a sequence in stylized *Kanaksprak* (12–18),
this is finally topped by intended Turkish items (*tam, tschucki*, 19–21).[16]

After this, the competition is over. The sequence is realized by competing assessments which increasingly deviate from Standard German (see Figure 1). It is not by chance that stylized *Kanaksprak* is mostly used for making assessments: Assessing terms are one of the most productive lexical fields in German youth slang (Androutsopoulos 1998: 434). New terms are

rapidly popularized as in-group markers and youth cultural capital. With their diffusion, however, they lose their distinctive prestige and therefore are in need of constant renewal. Stylized *Kanaksprak* is one current source for a prestigious enhancement of speakers' expressive repertoires.

<div align="center">

colloquial German (lines 01–04)

↓

conventionalized German youth slang (line 05)

↓

new German youth slang (line 06–08)

↓

stylized *Kanaksprak* (lines 12–18)

↓

stylized Turkish (lines 19–21; 26)

</div>

Figure 1. Code-competition

Starting with line 12, the sequence is no longer marked as disagreement (by negation, adversative connectives, etc.) and the turns lack referential specification (apart from Frank in lines 15–18).[17] As these assessments are semantically roughly equivalent, it is only the choice of the code that serves to outdo the opponent by rhetorical means. Stylized *Kanaksprak* is used as a device to win in a poetic competition. Since this competition is driven by a deployment of increasingly specialized youth cultural knowledge, the performance of stylized *Kanaksprak* can be seen as a display of youth cultural capital: the winner of the competition is the one who manages to perform the code which is linguistically most distinct from Standard German and which is sociosymbolically most specific. At the same time, the use of stylized *Kanaksprak* definitely turns the competition into collaborative play (cf. also Eckert 1993). Next speakers regularly repeat items produced by the previous speaker and amend them (see Table 3). This combination of

repetition (or 'format tying'; see Sacks 1992: 716; Goodwin 1990) and variation makes visible the fusion of collaboration and competition that is distinctive for this interative practice. It produces an emergent poetic structure which matches with Jakobson's (1960) basic definition of poetics as a meta-linguistic, self-reflexive construction built upon patterns of repetition and variation.[18]

Table 3. The sequential emergence of a pattern of repetition and variation

Turn	New items	Repeated from previous turn(s)
Denis lines 12–13	aldär konkret ober krass	
Bernd line 14	ultra	krass
Frank lines 16–18	geil den hab isch schon gesä:hn letzte jahr	ultra aldär
Denis lines 19–20	tam ey total	
Frank line 21	tschucki	tam aldär (tschucki)

In this segment, it becomes clear that stylized *Kanaksprak* is a youth cultural capital that can be used as a resource for self-positioning by an individual member of the in-group: it is a means to position oneself as a poetically and mimetically skilled entertainer. It enables the individual to successfully participate in peer-group routines of playful and entertaining competitions. As interpersonal competition and the production of funny moments in interaction are most highly valued among male adolescents (see Deppermann and Schmidt 2001a), the capacity to switch into stylized *Kanaksprak* at appropriate moments will contribute to enhance the individual's status as a peer-group member.

In the following excerpt, the boys ride in a car which is steered by the participant observer. They are heading for the Austrian valley "Stubaital". As Denis sees a road sign "Stubaital", he reads aloud: *Stubai* (line 05). Frank, who is smoking, repeats this turn and recontextualizes it as stylized *Kanaksprak*:

(4) Stubai (Juk 17)

```
01          ((technosounds from the car stereo))
02 Frank:   OA::h des is so ein BRETT das LIED-
            'WO::w that is such a HIT that SONG-'
03          (4.0)
04 Denis:   <<reading a road sign, f, scanning voice>
            stUbai->
05 Frank:   <<len> stu:bai Alder.> (-)
            'stu:bai Oldster. (-)'
06 Denis:   <<decr> Alder, (.)      hm?>
                    'Oldster, (.) hm?'
07          (4.0)
08 Frank:   ((exhales smoke and points to the microphone))
09          <<laughing>des find isch vOll KRA:SS
                    'this is mOst GRO::SS
            [dass isch den hab]
            ['that I got that']
10 Denis:   [hahaHA:'<<pp>haha>]
11 Frank:   komm isch mir vor wie den <<len>ULTRAkrassen re-
            pOrter>
            'feel like I am them ULTRAgro::ss reporter
12          weiß=du?'
            y=know?'
13 Denis:   <<looks for a magazine>>
            kann ich mal <<len> ultrakrass> noch mal was
            sehn?>
            'can I just ultragross see somethin once again?'
14 Alex:    <<refers to steering wheel> kannst=e mal halten
            bitte?>
            'can ya just hold please?'
15 Frank:   <<smiling voice> jetzt lenkt die <<len> AnnA:->
            'now Anna: steers-'¹⁹
16          (1.5)
17          <<slightly laughing, h> macht ma kein schEIß->
            'don't you make shIt-'
18          (5.0)
19          <<resuming previous topic> war der to:t?>
            'was he dea:d? '
20          (2.0)
21          der T↓Y::P; (.)
            'the G↓U::Y; (.)'
```

```
22 Denis: <<laughing>  konKRE::T->  (-)
                       'conCRE::TE-  (-)'
23 Frank: ich hätt jetzt mal lust auf ne <<English>
          BLUE 20;>
          'I just would like to have a BLUE now;'
```

The use of stylized *Kanaksprak* here is triggered by the word *stubai* (line 04). The combination of the vowels /u/ and /ai/ is rather uncommon for German; this strangeness is highlighted, because Denis leaves out the well-known part of the composite word, the German *-tal* ('valley'), and because of his scanning delivery with the first syllable shortened and a slightly backward articulation of the vowels. It cannot be verified if Denis uses these features to contextualize a strange language or if he even alludes to *Kanaksprak*[21] – maybe he just wants to point to the fact that the boys will reach their destination soon. However, Frank shows a sensitivity to the peculiar word and its rendering by repeating and recontextualizing it audibly as *Kanaksprak* (line 05). Apart from a slightly altered phonetics, this is done by adding the tag *alder* with its characteristic lenization of [t] to [d]. Denis now confirms this hearing by repeating the tag *alder* (line 06). After four seconds, Frank adds a topically unrelated, playful assessment that refers to the microphone he is equipped with (lines 09/11). The only coherence in this sequence lies in the fact that Frank stays with stylized *Kanaksprak*: the code of the interaction (and not its content) has become the focus, and thus it is perfectly adequate to produce a turn that can be heard as category-indicative of a prototypical *Kanaksprak*-speaker (bragging by making an extreme assessment).

We already noticed in the discussion of extract (3) that when switching into stylized *Kanaksprak* occurs, next speakers repeat (parts of) previous speakers' turns which were produced in stylized *Kanaksprak*. This is also found in extract (4):

In line 05 Frank repeats *stubai* from Denis' preceding turn,
Denis in turn repeats Frank's *alder* (lines 05–06),
Frank's *ultrakrass* (line 11) is taken up by Denis in line 13.

In my data, there are several sequences that are organized by such paired repeats: Next speaker repeats a *Kanaksprak*-item that the previous speaker produced, often adding a new item which in turn is repeated by the speaker who follows. Here is another example. The boys wait in a car and watch passers-by. Denis draws their attention to a girl (*muck*, line 01). Bernd suggests that this girl was the one who another member of the group, Wuddi,

had already admired at a night club (*pinguins*) they went to the evening before (lines 04/07). In lines 10, 11 and 15, Denis and Bernd produce assessments in *Kanaksprak* which are built as paired (partial) repeats:

(5) Muck (Juk 16)

```
01 Denis:  OA::r Oh ne MUCK-  (---)
           'wO::w Oh a CHICK-  (---)'
02 Bernd:  hhss::.  (---)
03 Frank:  wO↑uh-
           'wh↑Ere-'
04 Bernd:  <<p, whispering> pinguins->
           'penguins-'
05 Frank:  =mein gott.
           '=my god.'
06 Denis:  <<laughing> ähä> <<all> was was?>
           'aha what what?'
07 Bernd:  <<p,whispering> die hat de wuddi vorm pinguins
           angeguckt.>
           'wuddi looked at her in front of penguins.'
08 Wuddi:  <<negating> h::m' hm' hm'> (.)
09 Bernd:  (   ) de wuddi (      maske;) (-)
           ((incomprehensible))
10 Denis:  ((coughs and sneezes)) krass alder;
           'gross oldster;'
           ((sneezes))
11 Bernd:  krass alder; (--) korrekt ey;
           'gross oldster; (--) correct ay;'
12         (2.0)
13 Frank:  ach dem mayer sein rucksack geht mir auf=n sAck
           EY-
           'hey mayers bagpack really sUcks AY- (.)'
14         fällt mir dauernd auf de [knie.
           'always falls on my        [knees.'
15 Denis:                           [korrekte session.
                                  '[correct session.'
16 Bernd:  [=ähähä-    ]
           '[=ahaha-    ]'
17 Frank:  [am liebsten]   [würd=ich=n schmEIßen-]
           '[I would like] [to throw it-'
18 Alex:                   [kannste doch bei uns]
                         '[you can put it in   ]
           in de kofferraum tun.
           our baggage boot.'
```

In other cases there is no exact lexical repetition by the next speaker, but he aligns with the code-switch and performs an action of the same type as the previous speaker did (see e.g. extract (1)) – mostly an assessment.

How can we account for this sequential organization? In the group under study, the use of *Kanaksprak* for assessments is highly ritualized in several respects:

- It is clearly set off from surrounding talk (by inter-turn code-switching or metapragmatic framing as citation or category animation);
- it is restricted to a very small range of code-marking lexical resources (and few syntactic structures, if any);
- it is limited to the performance of only one type of action, that is, of playful assessments;
- it is sequentially organized by paired repeats and competitive alterations by next speakers.

The interactive practice of paired repeats is also very pervasive in the dialogues of the comedy-duo *Mundstuhl* (see section 2 and Androutsopoulos 2001). Paired repeats thus seem to act as a recognition display (cf. Schegloff 1979) in several ways: conversationally, next speaker displays that he has recognized the social style (*Kanaksprak*) into which the first speaker has switched by repeating his words (or at least by aligning with the code-switch and by repeating the type of action). By doing so, the next speaker also demonstrates that he recognizes, is willing to go along with and is also able to produce stylized *Kanaksprak*. Additionally, the speakers show shared knowledge of the media models, that is, their possession of youth cultural capital. In sum, paired repeats imply a highly ritualized reciprocity which accomplishes a sense of sharedness, belonging and the reciprocal confirmation of insider knowledge. Stylized *Kanaksprak* in assessments thus serves to confirm and reproduce the unity of the group by using the voice of the out-group for interactive routines that outsiders would not be able to participate in.

But what does this practice reveal about identity-conceptions associated with *Kanaksprak*? Playful assessments draw on category-indexical actions that portray the stereotypical speaker of *Kanaksprak*: He is someone who makes extreme assessments in a repetitive, highly ritualized and restricted way – someone who is ridiculous and a bit stupid. Although it is clearly not other-positioning of *Kanacken* that is interactionally relevant, the potential for other-positioning is perfectly in line with the results we gained for quo-

tations and category-animations. Additionally, however, it shows that stylized *Kanaksprak* is a youth cultural capital that can be used as a resource for self-positioning as an individual member of the in-group: It is a means to enhance status by positioning oneself as a poetically and mimetically skilled entertainer. Since competition and the production of funny moments in interaction are highly valued among male adolescents (see Deppermann and Schmidt 2001a), stylized *Kanaksprak* enables the individual to successfully take part in peer-group routines of playful and entertaining competitions.

While quotations and category-animations are used to portray the outgroup's identity, in the overwhelming majority of instances in my corpus stylized *Kanaksprak* is used to maintain the group's own sense of belonging by shared routines and shared knowledge of cherished media models. Simultaneously, the individual member of the group positions himself by taking part in sequences of collaborative competition. The use of stylized *Kanaksprak* is a display of youth cultural capital that is used for self-positioning and as a mood-marker. In these sequences, the stereotypical *Kanaksprak*-character is only faintly present as a constitutive backdrop, but he is not topicalized. Stylized *Kanaksprak* as a humorous device thus is marked by the kind of 'double indexicality' which Jane Hill (1995) attributes to Mock Spanish: While it overtly indexes funny mood, the speaker's humour, and his knowledge of media and culture, it tacitly indexes a potentially racist and prejudiced out-group identity that is confirmed and reproduced by the humorous practice. The issue of racism, however, is very difficult and well beyond the scope of this paper. Methodologically, it would require observational knowledge to which degree speakers' stylizations of *Kanaksprak* are based on direct linguistic experiences with ethnolectal speakers and which individual interactional experiences the adolescents under study had. In order to judge the possibly racist effects of stylization, its non-displayed situated interpretation, its consequences for direct interactions with ethnolectal speakers, their moral categorization and their chances for future social participation need to be verified. Since these questions, however, can not be answered on the basis of the conversational and ethnographic data of my study, the issue of racism cannot be settled compellingly.

5.   Conclusion

In Auer's (1988) terms, sequences of stylized *Kanaksprak* are 'code-transfers': they are insulated, mostly short sequences which are inserted into a stream of conversation in the speakers' unmarked colloquial variety. In this paper, I have identified three conversational practices involving such code-transfers: quotations, category-animations and playful assessments. Stylized *Kanaksprak* is used restrictively. It consists of a repertoire of lexical and grammatical elements, its use is strictly limited to few conversational environments and functions, and it is mostly organized in highly ritualized sequences.

The question of whether stylized *Kanaksprak* as found in my data is a secondary ethnolect, that rests on direct experience with ethnolectal speakers, or a tertiary ethnolect, derived from media sources (cf. Auer 2003), cannot be answered unambiguously. Stylized *Kanaksprak* in the media and in everyday conversations have quite a lot of linguistic and discursive features in common (compare Table 1 and Androutsopoulos 2001). The practice of 'paired repeats', phraseologisms such as *korrekte session* (see extract (5), line 12) and the universal article/pronoun *den* are borrowed from the media (namely *Mundstuhl*). As the adolescents claim when asked, other forms, however, are acquired by direct experience with ethnolectal speakers (e.g. *isch gib dir korrekt*, Turkish items, such as *tam* and *tschi tschucki tschai* used as a formula (literally: 'nothing good girls')).

The most frequent use of stylized *Kanaksprak* is discourse-related code-switching (Auer 1995a and 1998: 4): If it is not used for characterizing *Kanacken*, it is used as a mood-marker which contextualizes the ongoing interaction as funny and non-serious. This becomes especially evident when potentially conflictual matters are transformed into a collaborative playful competition by switching into stylized *Kanaksprak*. Stylized *Kanaksprak* goes nicely with general features of informal conversations among adolescents during leisure-time: they orient to creating entertaining and competitive sequences of interaction, which often are realized by collectively portraying out-group-members in a funny and derogatory way (Deppermann in press). The use of stylized *Kanaksprak* for playful assessments is not only the most frequent usage in my corpus, but seems to be the most popularized one in Germany in general. It needs only very few stereotypical items and does neither presuppose profound specific cultural nor linguistic knowledge, but provides for a prestigious enhancement of expressive means. These are applicable to almost any matter because of their semantic open-

ness.[22] A next step would be the integration of features of stylized *Kanaksprak* into the we-code.[23]

The combination of ethnographic and conversational analyses reveals that stylized *Kanaksprak* has a somewhat paradoxical status, which is similar to Mock Spanish in the U.S. (see Hill 1995): it has low prestige as a they-code, but it is also a high-prestigious cultural capital for the German boys. Stylized *Kanaksprak* has low prestige as code of a stigmatized out-group, and it is seen to be indexical of negative characteristics, such as showing off, violence, lack of civilization, intelligence and verbal competence. By ridiculing *Kanaksprak*, German speakers may symbolically take revenge and cope with feelings of inferiority or helplessness. The low prestige of *Kanaksprak* is mirrored by the fact that the German adolescents never used stylized *Kanaksprak* in a serious mood, never for performing conditionally relevant actions, never to perform first actions, to tell a story or to give an account. If stylized *Kanaksprak* were used seriously, the German adolescents could be heard to identify with the out-group which would entail the self-ascription of negative properties. German adolecents do not use stylized *Kanaksprak* in contact with the 'legitimate owners' of the code, that is, with male adolescents of Turkish, Arabic or similar origin, especially if they are unfamiliar (cf. Eksner 2001). This restriction most clearly points to the stereotyping potential that any use of stylized *Kanaksprak* might be seen to have for any recipient.

Stylized *Kanaksprak*, however, gains high prestige and counts as cultural capital, if it is used in a funny mood. The voice of the out-group is part of the artful display of poetic competencies and of youth cultural capital, that is of knowledge of widely appreciated media models. It is used for creating cohesion of the peer-group by shared routines, and for enhancing the status of the individual member of the in-group in playful competition.

As Sebba and Wootton (1998) and Li Wei (1998) have noted, identity-related functions of code-switching often cannot be easily discerned in the sequential organization of conversation, and it would certainly be an unjustified *petitio principii* to claim that code-switching is always identity-implicative. However, identity-concerns can be seen as being operative in the conversational background[24] and can be recovered by ethnographic research, which provides for a deeper understanding of specific features of interactional sequences at hand (cf. Auer 1995b). If we compare the three conversational practices of personal quotation, category-animation and playful assessments, other-positioning is either in the interactional focus (personal quotation and category-animation) or in the background (playful

assessments). Although a basic negative assessment of the *Kanaksprak-*speakers' identity always seems to be at play, this ascription still remains ambiguous. By switching to stylized *Kanaksprak*, the German boys are able to do and say things they would never say in their own voice (e.g. obscene threats as *isch fig disch*, or showing off). Playing with the voice of the other is a carnivalesque practice (see Bachtin 1990) that allows the speaker to assume a cool and violent attitude. Protected by a fool's cap, he may practice stigmatized ways of acting, without having to assume responsibility for his words that are framed as mere entertainment. In order to achieve this carnivalesque time-out, it is most important to unambiguously keep stylized *Kanaksprak* apart from serious contributions to the interaction. This is probably why we find no intra-turn code-switching to stylized *Kanaksprak* and why it is made up of few code-markers and is performed in an exaggerated phonology that makes sure from the very first syllable that the mood in operation now *must* be play.

In sum, the study shows how linguistic stereotypes which are distributed by the media are adopted by conversationalists and integrated with their everyday experience. Media sources provide speakers with linguistic blueprints they can use for interactional work on social categorization, stereotyping and coping with real-world experiences as well as a resource for interactional self-positioning, display of fandom and self-entertainment as the business of conversation. These multi-faceted symbolic layers are always at least potentially available as interpretive background to any instance of the use of stylized *Kanaksprak*. This complexity, the unserious mood and the mostly non-propositional nature of this practice make it a disputable and always deniable issue if it is merely fun or if a hidden racist stance is implicitly expressed.

Appendix: Transcription conventions (GAT, Selting et al. 1998)

[ ]	segments of talk spoken in overlap
=	latching, contraction of syllables
(.)	tiny gap between utterances (< 0.25 seconds)
(-)	pause 0.25–0.5 seconds
(--)	pause 0.5–0.9 seconds
(1.0)	pause measured in seconds
:	prolongation of a sound
strEssed	stressed vowel/syllable

.	deep-falling intonation
;	falling intonation
-	level intonation
,	rising intonation
?	high-rising intonation
(unclear)	dubious hearing
<<f> >	*forte*, loud
<<p> >	*piano*, soft voice
<<all> >	*allegro*, faster than surrounding segments of speech
<<len> >	*lento*, slower than surrounding segments of speech
<<cresc> >	*crescendo*, getting increasingly louder
<<high> >	comment on the way a segment is spoken
((sleeps))	description of activities
bold face	stylized *Kanaksprak*

Notes

1. *Kanaksprak* would never be used by immigrants themselves for their own code.
2. See Spitulnik (1996) for some general reflections on the appropriation of mass mediated linguistic forms by their recipients.
3. Keim (2003b) reports on Turkish youngsters in Germany who use stylized *Kanaksprak* modelled upon German media sources.
4. 'Jugend, Kommunikation, Medien: eine ethnographische Längsschnittuntersuchung der Kommunikationskultur in Jugendgruppen' ('Youth, communication, media: an ethnographic long-term-study of the culture of communication in adolescent peer-groups'), directed by Klaus Neumann-Braun at Frankfurt/ Main University and funded by a grant of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (NE 527/1 and 2). Members of the research team were Klaus Neumann-Braun, Axel Schmidt, Jana Binder and myself. Recordings were made in 1996–1998.

5. Some features of media stylizations are not found in authentic ethnolects, (epenthetic vowels, lack of umlaut and phraseological blends).
6. As to my knowledge, there are, however, no representative surveys concerning this topic.
7. Already at the beginning of the sequence, Denis used the categorization *komische hawacks* (line 01) which is clearly devaluating. It is still valid as an interpretative frame, when Denis starts his quotation.
8. Double-voicing phenomena were first described by Bakhtin (1981) with respect to literary novels, interestingly also in their function as humourous ironicizations.
9. Admittedly, there will be a continuum between quotations and category-animations. Quotations are not mere repetitions, but rhetorically designed constructions that are often rather fictitious (see Tannen 1989; Neisser 1981). Irrespective of questions of objective truth, there are varying degrees of speakers' claims to the accuracy of a quotation (Deppermann 1997; Günthner 1997): when something was said, if exact wording and intonation or just a gloss are reproduced, may be specified very precisely or left open. Sometimes it remains unclear whether the rendition of some definite speaker is intended, and thus in some cases it will be impossible to tell a quotation from a category-animation.
10. Not an individual speaker, but the group of the *Kanacken* as a whole counts as the author and the principal of category-animations (cf. Goffman 1981: 144).
11. Category-animations are most common in adolescents' interactions. Schwitalla (1986, 1994) shows how adolescents animate fictitious, category-indexical voices in order to characterize different out-groups, such as lower working class people (*asos*), social workers or parents.
12. Schwitalla (1986, 1994) also notes that male adolescents often use specific non-lexical sounds to mark codes and ways of speaking that they consider to be typical of the members of specific social categories.
13. *Lan* is an abbreviation of the full Turkish lexical form *oğlan*.
14. This phrase is often used by *Kanaksprak* speakers in our data, while playing bar-football. However, we do not find the mistaken congruence *ich gib* in these data.
15. Tertilt (1996: 198–206) presents a cultural-psychological analysis of this specific kind of ritual insulting among Turkish youngsters in Germany.
16. It is not clear if the boys consider the Turkish items as being part of *Kanaksprak* or as belonging to a distinct code. Put differently, we do not know if there is a code-switch from stylized *Kanaksprak* to intended Turkish, if we define codes from a members' perspective. In either case, however, it is obvious, that the Turkish items are much more alien to the German language, since they differ from German also lexically.

17. What is more, the agreement-token *tam* (lines 19–21) semantically contradicts the activity of opposing to one another. It is not clear, however, which meaning the boys attribute to this item.

18. In other cases there is no exact lexical repetition by the next speaker, but he aligns with the code-switch and performs an action of the same type as the previous speaker did (see extract 1) – mostly an assessment.

19. Anna is the female participant observer who sits next to the driver Alex.

20. *Blue* refers to a brand of cigarettes.

21. *Stubai* maybe heard as an assonance to the better known *Dubai* (name of one of the seven Arab Emirates), which undoubtedly belongs to the cultural domain associated with *Kanaksprak*.

22. Spitulnik (1996) discusses the conditions that favor the recontextualizing appropriation of linguistic materials.

23. Stylized *Kanaksprak* has already provoked processes of linguistic change in other non-standard varieties of German, especially in German youth slang. For instance, the high frequency of *krass*, its semantic despecification and the widening of its combinatory potential seem to be adopted from stylized *Kanaksprak*. Its phonetics (apical [r]), however, is not adopted – this feature marks a code-switch. The omission of local and directive prepositions also has increased among German adolescents. Compare Androutsopoulos (1999) for processes of grammaticalization in youth slang.

24. For foregrounded and backgrounded concerns with social identity and category-membership see Hausendorf (2000).

References

Androutsopoulos, Jannis
    1998   *Deutsche Jugendsprache*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
    1999   Grammaticalization in young people's language: The case of German. In: Belemans, Rob and Reinhild Vandekerckhove (eds.), *Variation in (Sub)standard Language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 155–176.
    2001   From the streets to the screens and back again: On the mediated diffusion of variation patterns in contemporary German. *University Papers L.A.U.D.*, Duisburg.
    2003   Jetzt speak something about italiano. Sprachliche Kreuzungen im Alltagsleben. *OBST* 65, 79–109.
Antaki, Charles and Sue Widdicombe (eds.)
    1998   *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage.

Auer, Peter

1988 A conversation-analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In: Heller, Monica (ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 187–213.

1995a The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In: Milroy, Leslie and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115–135.

1995b Ethnographic methods in the analysis of oral communication. Some suggestions for linguists. In: Quasthoff, Uta M. (ed.), *Aspects of Oral Communication*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 419–440.

1998 Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In: Auer, Peter (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, 1–27.

2003 'Türkenslang'. Ein jugendsprachlicher Ethnolekt des Deutschen und seine Transformationen. In: Häcki-Buhofer, Anne (ed.), *Spracherwerb und Lebensalter*. Tübingen: Francke, 255–264.

Auer, Peter and İnci Dirim

2003 Socio-cultural orientations, urban youth styles and the spontaneous acquisition of Turkish by non-Turkish adolescents in Germany. In: Androutsopoulos, Jannis and Alexandra Georgakopoulou (eds.), *Discourse Constructions of Youth Identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 223–246.

Bachtin, Michail M.

1990 *Literatur und Karneval*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M.

1981 Discourse in the novel. In: *Bakhtin, Mikhail M.: The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*, Michael Holquist (ed.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 259–422.

Bamberg, Michael

1997 Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7, 335–342.

Bauman, Richard and Charles L. Briggs

1990 Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19, 59–88.

Bourdieu, Pierre

1982 *Ce que parler veut dire*. Paris: Fayard.

1983 Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital. In: Kreckel, Richard (ed.), *Soziale Ungleichheit* (Soziale Welt Sonderband 2). Göttingen: Schwarz, 183–198.

Coupland, Nikolas
    1996   Pronunciation and the rich points of culture. In: Windsor Lewis, Jack
                (ed.), *Studies in General and English Phonetics*. London: Routledge,
                310–319.
    2001   Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society* 30, 345–375.
Deppermann, Arnulf
    1997   *Glaubwürdigkeit im Konflikt. Rhetorische Techniken in Auseinan-
                dersetzungsprozessen.* Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
    in press   Using the other for oneself – Conversational practices of represent-
                ing out-group-members among adolescents. In: De Fina, Anna, Mi-
                chael Bamberg, and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *Talk and Identity in
                Narrative and Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Deppermann, Arnulf and Axel Schmidt
    2001a   Hauptsache Spaß – Zur Eigenart der Gesprächskultur Jugendlicher.
                Der Deutschunterricht 6, 27–37.
    2001b   Disrespecting: A conversational practice for the negotiation of status
                in juvenile peer-groups. In: Németh, Enikö (ed.), *Pragmatics in
                2000: Selected Papers from the 7th International Pragmatics Con-
                ference*, vol. 2. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association, 156–
                164.
Dirim, İnci and Peter Auer
    2004   *Türkisch sprechen nicht nur die Türken. Über die Unschärfebezie-
                hung zwischen Sprache und Ethnie in Deutschland.* Berlin/New
                York: Walter de Gruyter.
Dittmar, Norbert and Olaf Rieck
    1977   Datenerhebung und Datenauswertung im Heidelberger Forschungs-
                projekt 'Pidgin-Deutsch spanischer und italienischer Arbeiter'. In:
                Bielefeld, Hans-Ulrich et al. (eds.), *Soziolinguistik und Empirie*.
                Wiesbaden: Athenaion, 59–71.
Eckert, Penelope
    1993   Cooperative competition in adolescent 'girl talk'. In: Tannen, Deb-
                orah (ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. New York: Ox-
                ford University Press, 32–61.
Eksner, Julia and Majorie F. Orellana
    2005   Liminality as linguistic process. In: Knoerre, J. (ed.), *Childhood and
                Migration*. Bielefeld: transcript, 175–206
Füglein, Rosemarie
    2000   Kanak Sprak. Eine ethnolinguistische Untersuchung eines Sprach-
                phänomens des Deutschen. Unpublished thesis, Bamberg.
Goffman, Erving
    1981   Footing. In: Goffman, Erving, *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell,
                124–159.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness
   1990   *He-Said-She-Said. Talk as Social Organisation among Black Children*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.

Günthner, Susanne
   1997   Direkte und indirekte Rede in Alltagsgesprächen – zur Interaktion von Syntax und Prosodie in der Redewiedergabe. In: Schlobinski, Peter (ed.), *Syntax des gesprochenen Deutsch*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 227–262.
   1999   Polyphony and the 'layering of voices' in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31, 685–708.
   2002   Stimmenvielfalt im Diskurs: Formen der Stilisierung und der Ästhetisierung in der Redewiedergabe. *Gesprächsforschung* 3, 59–80.
               http://www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de/heft2002/ga-guenthner.pdf
               [Date of access: 30-8-2006].

Harré, Rom and Luk van Langenhove
   1999   *Positioning Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hartung, Martin
   2002   *Ironie in der Alltagssprache*. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.
               http://www.verlag-gespraechsforschung.de/2002/mhartung.htm
               [Date of access: 1-5-2007].

Hausendorf, Heiko
   2000   *Zugehörigkeit durch Sprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Heritage, John and David R. Watson
   1979   Formulations as conversational objects. In: Psathas, George (ed.), *Everyday Language*. New York: Irvington, 123–162.

Hill, Jane H.
   1995   Mock Spanish: A site for the indexical reproduction of Racism in American English.
               http://www.language-culture.org/colloquia/symposia/hill-jane/ [Date of access: 10-2-2004].

Hinnenkamp, Volker
   1982   *'Foreigner Talk' und 'Tarzanisch'. Eine vergleichende Studie über die Sprechweise gegenüber Ausländern am Beispiel des Deutschen und des Türkischen*. Hamburg: Buske.

Hymes, Dell
   1996   *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality. Toward an Understanding of Voice*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Jakobson, Roman
   1960   Concluding statement: Linguistic and poetics. In: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *Style and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 350–377.

Jayyusi, Lena
   1984   *Categorization and the Moral Order*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kallmeyer, Werner
   1995   Zur Darstellung von kommunikativem sozialem Stil in soziolinguistischen Gruppenportraits. In: Keim, Inken (ed.), *Kommunikative Stilistik einer sozialen Welt 'kleiner' Leute*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1–25.

Kallmeyer, Werner and Inken Keim
   1994   Phonologische Variation als Mittel der Symbolisierung sozialer Identität in der Filsbachwelt. In: Kallmeyer, Werner (ed.), *Exemplarische Analysen des Sprachverhaltens in Mannheim*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 141–249.
   2003a   Eigenschaften von sozialen Stilen der Kommunikation. Am Beispiel einer türkischen Migrantinnengruppe. *OBST* 65, 35–56.
   2003b   Linguistic variation and the construction of social identity in a German–Turkish setting. A case study of an immigrant youth-group in Mannheim/Germany. In: Androutsopoulos, Jannis and Alexandra Georgakopoulou (eds.), *Discourse Constructions of Youth Identities*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 29–46.

Keim, Inken
   2002   Bedeutungskonstitution und Sprachvariation. Funktionen des 'Gastarbeiterdeutsch' in Gesprächen jugendlicher Migrantinnen. In: Deppermann, Arnulf and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), *Be-deuten. Wie Bedeutung im Gespräch entsteht*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 134–157.
   2003a   Social style of communication and bilingual speech practices: Case study of three migrant youth groups of Turkish origin in Mannheim/Germany. *Turkic Languages* 6(2), 284–300.
   2003b   Die Verwendung medialer Stilisierungen von *Kanaksprak* durch Migrantenjugendliche. *Kodikas/Code* 26(1–2), 97–111.
   2007   *Die 'türkischen Powergirls'. Lebenswelt und kommunikativer Stil einer Migrantinnengruppe in Mannheim*. Tübingen: Narr.

Korobov, Neill
   2001   Reconciling theory with method: From conversation analysis and critical discourse analysis to positioning analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Research* 2(3). http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/3-01/3-01Korobov-e.htm [Date of access:1-5-2007].

Kotthoff, Helga

2002 Irony, quotation and other forms of staged intertextuality: Double or contrastive perspectivation in conversation. In: Graumann, Carl F. and Werner Kallmeyer (eds.), *Perspective and Perspectivation in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 201–233.

2004 Overdoing culture? Sketch-Komik, Typenstilisierung und Identitätsbildung bei Kaya Yanar. In: Hörnig, Karl H. and Julia Reuter (eds.), *Doing Culture*. Bielefeld: transcript, 184–201.

Labov, William

1972 On the mechanism of linguistic change. In: Gumperz, John J. and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 512–538.

Levinson, Stephen C.

1988 Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In: Drew, Paul and Anthony Wootton (eds.), *Erving Goffman – Exploring the Interaction Order*. Oxford: Polity, 161–227.

Li Wei

1998 The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In: Auer, Peter (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, 156–176.

Lucius-Hoene, Gabriele and Arnulf Deppermann

2002 *Rekonstruktion narrativer Identität*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

Neisser, Ulrich

1981 John Dean's memory: A case study. *Cognition* 9, 1–22.

Rampton, Ben

1995 *Crossing. Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

1998 Language crossing and the redefinition of reality. In: Auer, Peter (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation*. London: Routledge, 290–317.

Rampton, Ben (ed.)

1999 Styling the Other. Special issue of *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4).

Sacks, Harvey

1972 On the analyzability of stories by children. In: Gumperz, John and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Speaking*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 325–345.

1992 *Lectures on Conversation*, vol. 1. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, Emmanuel A.
  1979   Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings.
            In: Psathas, George (ed.), *Everyday Language*. New York: Irvington,
            23–78.

Schwitalla, Johannes
  1986   Jugendliche 'hetzen' gegen Passanten – Drei Thesen zur ethnogra-
            phischen Gesprächsanalyse. In: Hartung, Wolfdietrich (ed.), *Unter-
            suchungen zur Kommunikation*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissen-
            schaften, 248–261.
  1994   Die Vergegenwärtigung einer Gegenwelt – Sprachliche Formen der
            sozialen Abgrenzung einer Jugendlichengruppe in Vogelstang. In:
            Kallmeyer, Werner (ed.), *Kommunikation in der Stadt*, vol. 1. Ber-
            lin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 467–509.

Sebba, Mark and Tony Wootton
  1998   We, they and identity: Sequential versus identity-related explanation
            in code-switching. In: Auer, Peter (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conver-
            sation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, 262–
            286.

Selting, Margret et al.
  1998   Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem (GAT). *Linguistische
            Berichte* 173, 91–122.

Spitulnik, Debra
  1996   The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of com-
            munities. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6(2), 161–187.

Tannen, Deborah
  1989   *Talking Voices*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Tertilt, Hermann
  1996   *Turkish Power Boys. Ethnographie einer Jugendbande*. Frankfurt am
            Main: Suhrkamp.

Zaimoğlu, Feridun
  1995   *Kanaksprak*. Hamburg: Rotbuch.

Chapter 12
Identity and language construction in an online community: The case of 'Ali G'

Mark Sebba[*]

1. Introduction

Ethnicity, whether for analysts or for the general public, is a difficult topic. In Britain, many years of high-profile media coverage and political debate about issues to do with 'ethnic minorities' ensure that the subject, at least in public, is a sensitive one, surrounded by taboos, laws and a public concern for 'political correctness'.[1] For a period in the 1970s, 'race' was considered completely out of bounds as a joking matter in public, especially in the newspapers and broadcast media. Later, during the 1980s and 1990s, a number of comedians and actors who themselves were from ethnic minority backgrounds created successful television series which highlighted ethnicity and made it the subject of humour.[2] For most 'white' comics, the subject remained too controversial for the broadcast media. The kinds of cosmopolitan, liberal audiences who might appreciate jokes relating to ethnicity were also those most sensitive to any hint of 'racism'. The media remained extremely cautious in what they would permit.

In 1999, the character 'Ali G' made his first appearance hosting interviews on a late-night comedy program. 'Ali G' styles himself a 'hip hop journalist' and presents himself as a youthful gang leader – of ambiguous ethnicity but based on an apparently black stereotype – complete with stereotypical mannerisms, language and dress in a hip hop style. In his guise as a young 'ethnic' chat show host with an unusual background, 'Ali G' was successful in persuading various high-ranking politicians, media celebrities and pillars of the community to be interviewed – and held up to ridicule through trial by *double-entendre*, typically by playing on words with apparently innocent meaning which have subcultural meanings to do with sex, drugs or gang warfare. Later, as the joke became more widely known, unsuspecting public figures became hard to find in Britain and 'Ali G' had